

Published at www.GSBaptistChurch.com/theology/th801report.epub or [.pdf](#) or [.odt](#)

ADVANCED SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY TH801
WRITTEN REPORT

A Written Report Presented to the Faculty
of Louisiana Baptist University

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for
Doctorate of Philosophy in Theological Studies

By
Edward Rice
August, 2013

| | |
|--|-----------|
| <u>TH 801 Notes on the Writing Assignment</u> | <u>1</u> |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Preface and Chapter 1 Prolegomena (3-16).....</u> | <u>4</u> |
| Chafer's Preface | 4 |
| Chafer's Prolegomena..... | 10 |
| <u>Review & Critique of Chafer's Chapter 2-9 Bibliology (21-124).....</u> | <u>15</u> |
| Chafer's Bibliology's Natural Divisions Are Not Natural..... | 16 |
| Chafer's Bibliology Is Fractured Badly | 18 |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 10-13 Theology Proper (129-180).....</u> | <u>26</u> |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 14 The Attributes of God (187-224).....</u> | <u>28</u> |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 15 Divine Decrees (pg. 225-259).....</u> | <u>32</u> |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 16 The Names of Deity (260-271).....</u> | <u>34</u> |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 17-19 Trinitarianism (272-317).....</u> | <u>35</u> |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 20-26 God The Son (318-395).....</u> | <u>37</u> |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 27 God the Holy Spirit (397-413).....</u> | <u>37</u> |
| <u>Review and Critique of Chafer's Volume 1 Conclusion.....</u> | <u>37</u> |
| <u>Appendix 1 A Proper Bibliology (First Draft).....</u> | <u>38</u> |
| Inspiration Defined..... | 40 |
| Inspiration of ALL SCRIPTURE..... | 41 |
| <u>Appendix 2 A Proper Naturalistic Theism (First Draft).....</u> | <u>44</u> |
| <u>Appendix 3 A Proper Theology Proper (First Draft).....</u> | <u>47</u> |
| <u>Appendix 4 Covenant Theology Burkenshaw's Unsolicited Input.....</u> | <u>50</u> |
| <u>BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</u> | <u>52</u> |

TH 801 Notes on the Writing Assignment

The Assignment for Louisiana Baptist Theological Seminary's TH 801 – Advanced Systematic Theology I, was to “*Read Lewis S. Chafer’s volume 1¹ p.21-125 for “Bibliology” and p.129-414 for “Theology Proper” and also read carefully the corresponding sections in the two supplemental textbooks.*” I have included comparisons to several 'supplemental textbooks.' Systematic Theology, has been a deep seated interest of this author who spent 20 years as a systems engineer in the USAF, ergo systematic analysis and modeling are seen as crucial to understanding the bigger pictures of things, especially ones theology. Of particular interest are the works of Charles Hodge (1797-1878), the oldest systematic theology, albeit Presbyterian, found in my library; the works of Augustus H. Strong (1836-1921), the only Baptist systematic theology found in my library; and the works of Henry C. Thiessen (?-1947), his “Lectures in Systematic Theology” being most recently added to my library, and that because of my LBTS studies towards my masters of theological studies. Although Thiessen was president of the Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary², my studies of his doctrine caused me to paint

1 Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, (Dallas Seminary Press, 1948).

2 The Master's College was founded as Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary on May 25, 1927 to meet the need for a fundamentalist Baptist school on the West Coast. The intention was to provide a biblical and Christcentered education consistent with those doctrines of the historic Christian faith. Dr. William A. Matthews, pastor of Memorial Baptist Church of Los Angeles, became the founder and first president. The seminary was extended an invitation to be temporarily housed at Calvary Baptist Church in the Los Angeles area. Several more moves followed until the seminary moved onto its own property in Los Angeles in 1942. Dr. Matthews died at his home on August 18, 1943. He was succeeded by presidents C. Gordon Evanson, Floyd Burton Boice, and **Henry C. Thiessen**. In 1946, the seminary became a graduate-level school and initiated a separate undergraduate and liberal arts program. **Following Dr. Thiessen's death in 1947**, Dr. Herbert V. Hotchkiss and Dr. Milton E. Fish, a Harvard graduate, strengthened the school scholastically and spiritually. August 14, 1959 marked a change, as Dr. John R. Dunkin became president, succeeding Dr. Carl M. Sweazy, who returned to full-time evangelism. The new president continued the scriptural position of the school's leadership. From: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Master's_College, although wikipedia is not a trusted source for citing one's research it was the only available source that revealed Dr. Thiessen as a past president of Master's College.

him more as a neoevangelical, reformed theologian than as a Baptist. Dr. Robert L. Sumner, Editor of THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST paper, who knew Dr. Thiessen personally, however, strongly contested such a categorization³. Other textbooks, I compared, with authors too timid to call their works Systematic Theology, include Charles C. Ryrie's "Basic Theology", Millard J. Erickson's "Christian Theology" and a revered and distinctively Independent Baptist's 1954 work "Bible Doctrines" by Mark G. Cambron, a professor at Tennessee Temple Bible School. Occasional comparison was made to the intellectual but very Calvinist and Reformed Theology work "Dogmatic Theology" by William G. T. Shedd (1820–1894). It is a vintage work of an Old School Presbyterian who held fast to the Westminster Standards. Unfortunately these Reformed Theology Calvinist Standards have gotten their fingers into every Systematic Theology this author has studied. The jury is still out on Chafer, who wrote his Systematic Theology only fifty some years after Shedd's, the oldest of these type of works. Notable

3 Dear friend, How many mistakes can you make in one sentence? Are you going for a Guinness World Record? I refer to your opening one: "In my Theology 504 class I am required to read the Reformed Augustinian Theology book of Thiessen, a neoevangelical and past president of MacArthur's Master's College, and write and answer questions about his ecclesiology."

Note the errors:

1. Thiessen was not Reformed. He was a Baptist.
2. Thiessen was not Augustinian. He was a moderate Calvinist who denied unconditional election, limited atonement and irresistible grace.
3. Thiessen was not a neoevangelical. He was a Fundamentalist and a separationist.
4. Thiessen was not a past president of MacArthur's Master's College. He was a past president of the Los Angeles Baptist College and Seminary and went to Heaven long before the school was divided, the Seminary going north to Tacoma and becoming the Northwest Baptist Theological Seminary and the college taken over by MacArthur. Mac renamed it Master's College, but Thiessen had nothing to do with that, of course.

I knew Thiessen personally. He was a good man. I heard him teach the entire Book of Revelation in one sermon one night (he was pretrib and premil) when he had just become president of L.A.B.C & S. The chapter you reference in Thiessen's book is titled "The Ordinances of the Church" (not sacraments, a term he did not use for reasons with which both of us fundamental Baptists are familiar. And he limited the ordinances to two, just like you and I do: baptism and the Lord's Supper.

Please do not malign good, noble dead men by giving them titles and positions theologically they never dreamed in their wildest imaginations of holding.

Dr. Robert L. Sumner, Editor, THE BIBLICAL EVANGELIST, 134 Salisbury Circle, Lynchburg, VA 24502-5056 (via my email 3/5/2011)

works not consulted in this research would include both Johnathan Edwards (1703-1758) who was more of a philosophical theologian than a systematic theologian, and John Calvin's (1509-1564) magnum opus "Institutes of Christian Religion." Both Edwards, and Calvin's reformed theology are systematically captured in Charles Hodge's Presbyterian systematic theology. Additionally this effort includes analysis of Chafer's preface and chapter 1 on Prolegomena. Although not assigned, these are crucial to an analysis of his systematic theology as a whole.

The assignment included this tasking: "From each chapter of Chafer's book, ... prepare a detailed outline or discussion on each chapter with a full explanation of the terms involved. ... chapter outlines (or discussion?) will be graded as if they were to be used for training others." Chapter outlines are already created in the extensive table of contents that Chafer's work entailed. Consequently a thorough 'discussion' and full critique for each chapter is presented herein. I did not intend that these essays be used to regurgitate all the information of each chapter, rather that they be a constructive criticism of Chafer's work as well criticizing the whole current field of systematic theology.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Preface and Chapter 1 Prolegomena (3-16)

Chafer's Preface

The preface by Chafer is essential reading if one is to comprehend the purpose of yet another voluminous systematic theology. Therein he clarifies how all previous volumes are lacking. He makes this clarification “A lifelong investigation into works on Systematic Theology has resulted in the discovery that in the field of doctrine a least seven major themes are consistently neglected.”⁴ Chafer points out that few readers would pick up an unabridged work of Hodge or Strong and detect what is left out of such an extensive systematic theology. His list of seven all attach to the fact that all previous systematic theologies are biased with reformed theology. Indeed Covenant Theology, springs from a well dug by John Calvin, seeps from the bitter water of the Roman Catholic Theologian, and then taints every previous Systematic Theology.

Chafer mentions his survey of 20 Systematic Theology works⁵, giving never so many citations of them, ergo his work will exceed this analysis of few. A survey of previous Systematic Theology efforts begins with Shedd's 1888 short work which includes in its preface: “The general type of doctrine is the Augustino-Calvinistic. Upon a few points, the elder Calvinism has been followed in preference to the later. This, probably, is the principal difference between this treatise and contemporary ones of the Calvinistic class.”⁶ When William Shedd thus classifies only 500 pages his whole systematic theology, one expects to find little worth from it compared to Charles Hodge's

4 Ibid., xi.

5 Ibid, xxx.

6 William G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology* (Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, Charles Scribner & Sons, 1888), v.

massive effort. Hodge has an expansive 4 volumes, is a Presbyterian Minister and Princeton Theologian, and published his systematic theology seventeen years earlier, in 1871. Hodge shall be the worthy spokesman for the prominent features of Protestant theology, i.e. Covenant Theology, sometimes called Federal Theology.

Consider that Covenant Theology is exactly opposite to Dispensational Theology which Chafer is going to espouse. It taints Bibliology, because it requires that promises made to Israel be allegorical gobbledygook; it taints election because in Covenant Theology Christians are the new-elect, replacing the Jew; Covenant Theology taints the Church, because the it must be Catholic, not local, because it is to completely replace Israel; the Covenant Theology card is played over and over again getting a bias into every major doctrine of the Bible. Chafer is purposed to lower his head, grit his teeth and charge headlong into this biasing. One has got to expect some theological excitement in his outcome.

Consider the seven omissions that Chafer details.

(1) The divine program of the ages: Chafer will present and defend various dispensations, rightly divided, accurately discerned to reveal a comprehensive divine program. This aspect of Chafer's work is completely untouched by any previous Systematic Theology work.

(2) The Church, the Body of Christ: When a retired systems engineer picks up another eight volumes of systematic theology expect some profound critiques. Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer steps back from all previous theologians and profoundly presents a view he labels "The Church, the Body of Christ." When one accepts the dispensational truth of Scripture, and then rightly divides the Word of Truth, the Church, being the body

of Christ, occupies a central role of this dispensation, but not all dispensations. When the Covenant Theology of John Calvin and Roman Catholicism exalts the Catholic Church to occupy the central theme of all ages and all time, insisting that it swallow and replace Israel, as God's chosen and elect, insisting that it swallow and replace all the promises made to Israel, to Jerusalem, to Zion, to their regathering, to the literal throne of David, and to their 12 tribes and 144 thousand witnesses, it places an unpardonable strain on not only Biblical prophecy, but on the whole Bible, from Genesis to maps, and especially on the Revelation of Jesus Christ. Now, they say, only a few spiritually enlightened 'clergy' can see and interpret this allegorical, hidden and secret meaning of Scripture. That such nonsense, springing from Roman Catholic Church Fathers, Saint Clement of Alexandria, and Saint Origin of Alexandria, made it intact through the Protestant Reformation, and got grounded into John Calvin's Institutes, is downright diabolical. Chafer steps away from this bias to write a dispensational systematic theology that presents what the Bible actually intimates about the Church, the Body of Christ. It is unfortunate that Baptists, and even Baptist Preachers do not spend significant time studying theology, the greatest of the sciences. Only a little such study would keep Baptists well distanced from the Calvinistic TULIPS and their Reformed Theology that never really got reformed.

(3) Human conduct: Again previous lack of a dispensational theology, and the total swallowing of covenant theology, necessitates that Chafer revisit an area totally overlooked by previous systematic theologies. Everything about human conduct during this dispensation of grace needed to be revisited. And, consequentially, human conduct during other dispensations is brought into clearer focus. Ergo Chafer's preface contains

remarkable insight to previous lack in theology books, and that shows up particularly well in his discussion of the peculiar walk and daily life of the Christian. For such a peculiar walk he observes that there is a list of nine differences:

1. Motive – walking worthy of the calling wherewith he is called
2. Standards of living – a new commandment I give unto you
3. Method in his warfare – becoming spiritual in spite of the flesh
4. Character and Cure of the Christians sin- its prevention via the Word of God, the indwelling of the Spirit, and the interceding of Christ in heaven, and its effect of loss of fellowship with God, loss of peace with God and loss of power with God.
5. Relationships – to God the Father, to God the Son, and to God the Holy Spirit, plus a different relationship “to Satan, to the world-system, to himself, to human governments, to the body of Christ, to the unregenerate, to ecclesiastical authorities, husbands to wives, wives to husbands, parents to children, children to parents, masters to servants, servants to masters, the strong to the weak, the weak to the strong.”⁷
6. Capacity as a witness – pilgrim, stranger, ambassador, the word of reconciliation.
7. Suffering and sacrifice – if you do right you might suffer wrong for it, the godly will suffer persecution.
8. Efficacious faith and prevailing prayer – whatsoever ye ask in my name ...
9. Rewards – more than a mere systems of ethics – He is coming, bringing your reward with him.

(4) Angelology: Chafer calls previous coverage of Angelology very

⁷ Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, xxv.

restrictive because it did not consider dispensationalism. One must expect his development will bear that out more than his preface did. Previous developments of Angelology have been very thorough, and it is a systematic sidebar more than a mainstay.

(5) Typology: Intimated as the most neglected department of theological science, Typology will need a complete development by Chafer. When previous Systematic Theologies did not recognize the changes in dispensations, there was little need for typologies to be explored. Chafer presents great promise to remedy that dilemma.

(6) Prophecy: Predictive prophecy is another area in which errant Covenant Theology completely allegorized away using Roman Catholic Saint Origen's defunct hermeneutics. Chafer's Systematic Theology is to be the first which is completely independent of both errant practices.

(7) The present session of Christ in heaven: Previous works of Systematic Theology did not differentiate dispensations, and thus the present role of Christ in heaven during this age of grace called the Church age has been left largely unexplored. Again, Chafer's preface presents great promise to remedy that dilemma.

The Preface of Chafer's book, yeah any book, is there to be read. In it he lays out his grand purpose and direction, distinguishing his Systematic Theology from all previous works. It is an exceptional study. Charles Hodge had no preface. His purpose and tack⁸ must be gleaned from his first few chapters. Augustus H. Strong lays out a

8 American Heritage Dictionary, 3rd ed., s.v. "tack" - 4.a. A course of action meant to minimize opposition to the attainment of a goal. b. An approach, especially one of a series of changing approaches.

purpose apropos to his day and his conflict with Ritschl and Kantian, whose *relativism* created a practical denial of Christ's deity.⁹ Ergo, Strong powerfully presents “That Christ is the one and only Revealer of God, in nature, in humanity, in history, in science, in Scripture, is in my judgment the key to theology.”¹⁰ But Augustus Strong, indeed a Baptist, swallows Reformed Theology almost completely, never clarifying different dispensations, or differentiating the election of Israel from the election of Gentile believers. Both elections are an election to service, neither being an election to salvation. When one reads Strong's Systematic Theology after grounding himself in his preface, you find Strong's purpose is thoroughly accomplished, albeit his purpose was not lofty enough to repair the breaches in systematic theology, breaches made via Covenant Theology and well secured in Reformed Theology.

To be fair Charles Ryrie, with an excellent handle on the dispensations, never attempted a Systematic Theology but titled his work “Basic Theology.” His preface, which he calls, “Who should read theology”, depicts his purpose: “Theology is for everyone. Indeed, everyone needs to be a theologian. In reality, everyone is a theologian of one sort or another. ... Theology simply means thinking about God and expressing those thoughts in some way.”¹¹ Such a shallow definition assures us that Ryrie will not herein attain a Systematic Theology and his profound understanding and expression of Dispensational Theology will not significantly come to bare on the previous shortfalls of that discipline. The onus for such responsibility rests on Chafer, and his preface takes full charge of the challenge.

9 Augustus H. Strong, *Systematic Theology: Three Volumes in 1* (Philadelphia, Valley Forge PA, The Judson Press, 1907), ix.

10 Ibid., vii.

11 Charles C. Ryrie, *Basic Theology* (Victor Books, Wheaton, Illinois, 1981), 9.

Millard J. Erickson's "Christian Theology" has an extensive preface. Erickson, having taught Systematic Theology for 22 years, holds to what is called classical orthodoxy, and his 3 volumes of Systematic Theology is intended to present an "evangelical perspective" that was missing from previous works. He carefully tip toes through Reformed Theology and Covenant Theology upsetting no apple carts, while there are many apple carts of bad apples that need to be overturned. There is little value added with his 'everybody-is-right' and 'nobody-is-wrong', avoidance of confrontation. He does not readily contend for the faith in his work.

Chafer, then, has the baton in the race to secure a sound systematic theology which conforms completely to Scripture. In his own words it will take years of review before it could be determine what is omitted; primarily, one must review only what is presented. The purpose of these pages is to accomplish such a thorough review. The finite human attempting the impossible task of capturing an infinite God in a Systematic Theology is indeed the call of man. Solomon says "And I gave my heart to seek and search out by wisdom concerning all things that are done under heaven: this sore travail hath God given to the sons of man to be exercised therewith. ... I have seen the travail, which God hath given to the sons of men to be exercised in it." (Ecc 1:13, 3:10)

Chafer's Prolegomena

A Prolegomena is a preliminary discussion, especially a formal essay, introducing a work of considerable size and complexity. In Chafer's essay, he provides 12 general classifications of theology ending with *Systematic Theology*. The thoroughly developed definition he provides is: "Systematic Theology may be defined as the collecting,

scientifically arranging, comparing, exhibiting, and defending of all facts from any and every source concerning God and His works. It is *thetic* in that it follows a humanly devised thesis form and presents and verifies truth as *truth*.¹² This definition is a thorough incorporation of all previous attempts, many of which are recited in his introduction. The only lack in Chafer's definition may be that it misses some charge that systematic theology is the duty and travail of every man. (cf Ecc 1:13, 3:10)

Dr. Chafer develops seven essential requirements for systematic theology which need recognition and comment. The first essential is that “the inspiration and authority of the Scriptures are assumed.”¹³ Although he does finally state that the theologian is a Biblicist who regards the Bible as the sole rule of faith and practice, and the only dependable source of information, and he does clarify that systematic theology must proceed upon the *certitude* that the Scriptures are the Oracles of God, and he contends that modern, rationalists cast doubts as to verbal inspiration, revelation, and Biblical authority, Dr. Chafer does not here assert that believing in an inspired, infallible, inerrant Bible is the essential. The modern, rationalists who cast their doubts lead with one which states 'only the original manuscripts were inspired, and they are all lost.' Dr. Chafer does buy into that doubt and his inability to clearly state that **a plenary verbally inspired, infallible, inerrant, preserved Bible** is an essential requirement for a truthful systematic theology is a fissure from that doubt. His wordy, sidestepping, tip toeing, 300 word paragraph which does not clarify this truth is shameful.

A second essential to a thorough and accurate systematic theology are some laws of methodology. Dr. Chafer delineates a *scientism*, an exegete of original languages, and

12 Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 6.

13 *Ibid.*, 7.

an *induction* to outline good methodology. He seems to level a charge onto the previous reformed and covenant theologians. A charge of misrepresenting the truths of Scripture with a disproportionate emphasis which misrepresents and changes the truth committed to him. He then calls out *scientism*, which must refer to the therein undefined scientific method,¹⁴ as the entity which repels untruth, part truth, and every form of unfounded prejudice or preconceived notion. Again Chafer emphasizes “the importance of ascertaining and holding the truth in its absolute purity and right proportions” and then assigns this task to a scientific method, a scientific attitude, and extended labor.

When it comes to learning the Biblical languages the old high school teenager question comes to mind: *Why do I need to learn this?* Lewis Sperry Chafer writes:

As the meaning of the truths of Scripture is best expressed in the original languages, it is essential that the theologian shall be an exegete in these languages and thus informed as fully as possible concerning the precise character of the message of God with which he is to deal. It is irrational for any scientist to disregard or underestimate the essential value of any portion of the material with which his science is concerned. In like manner, the science of Systematic Theology will be incomplete and misleading to the extent that it disregards or misinterprets any portion of the divine revelation. The worthy student of Systematic Theology, were he not qualified for the higher and more inclusive title of theologian, would be entitled to recognition as super-scientist, which he is.¹⁵

Perhaps there should be some squares under this paragraph; squares which say *like, dislike, agree, disagree*. Even so, one must agree there is some truth here, and some value in studying the Hebrew language. After studying the King James Bible in English

14 The scientific method has four steps 1. Observation and description of a phenomenon or group of phenomena. 2. Formulation of an hypothesis to explain the phenomena. In physics, the hypothesis often takes the form of a causal mechanism or a mathematical relation. 3. Use of the hypothesis to predict the existence of other phenomena, or to predict quantitatively the results of new observations. 4. Performance of experimental tests of the predictions by several independent experimenters and properly performed experiments. If the experiments bear out the hypothesis it may come to be regarded as a theory or law of nature. If the experiments do not bear out the hypothesis, it must be rejected or modified. (from http://teacher.nsr1.rochester.edu/phy_labs/ accessed 06/20/2013).

15 Ibid., 8.

for 50 years, and relying on the unparalleled, if not perfect, translation effort of 57 genius linguists, organized into 6 groups, laboring for 7 years and finishing their labor in 1611,¹⁶ however, and after struggling to even grasp the pure use of any Hebrew script, this author cannot see added value in the realm of Biblical exegesis from the original languages.

Learning Hebrew will add an awe to the miracle of Scripture's writing and preservation, and it will add some linguistic tools that help in communicating Biblical truths, but little more. Any and all effective exegesis will be accomplished with a King James English Bible, and that has been reliable truth since 1611 A.D. It is unfortunate, that Chafer has missed that important fact.

Chafer's laws of methodology essential to systematic theology conclude with an excellent differentiation between *deduction and induction*. He calls these two methods of dealing with the truth of God's Word. Deduction is the marvelous ability of the thinking man to draw a conclusion by reason. One who does this well can prepare a sermon well and reach the conclusion of a matter. Its relation to truth depends on whether the conclusion of the matter aligns with God's conclusion of the matter. But Chafer deduces that *induction* is taking these various conclusions and reducing them to one harmonious and all-inclusive statement. In actuality, and more concretely, induction is the process of deriving general principles from particular facts or instances, and the conclusion reached by this process.¹⁷ This is something a theologian does, the former, deduction, something a preacher does. The statement "A preacher should never preach theology, but a preacher should never preach without theology." rings with clarified truth in this analysis.

Consider now that "perfect induction is formed when all the teachings of the

16 D.A. Waite, *Defending the King James Bible*, (The Bible For Today Press, 2002), 66.

17 American Heritage Dictionary, 3rd ed., s.v. "Induction."

Scripture, according to their precise meaning, are made the basis of a doctrinal statement.”¹⁸ The finite trying to grasp the infinite in a systematic theology, i.e. a systematic induction, will ideally strive to that perfection. Know that taking all the *'whosoever will may come'* situations out of consideration will result in an *imperfect* induction and a doctrine of election and predestination which is flawed. The sincerity or genius of the founders is not herein the flaw. Consider then what is the flaw. Systematically favoring some outcomes over others is called bias. When orthodoxy is carried into our systematic theology there is a bias and there is error. A naked slate, an open infallible Bible, and an inductive methodology are essential to a theologian. Consider the challenge of each. Then, and only then, consider the seven essentials which Chafer lists.

The essentials to developing a right systematic theology are:

1. The inspiration and authority of the Scriptures are assumed.
2. The laws of methodology are as essential.
3. Finite limitations must be recognized.
4. Spiritual illumination is necessary.
5. Patient and tireless study is required.
6. Faith.
7. Systematic theology must be unabridged.

The induction method, the process of deriving general principles from particular facts or instances, that builds a systematic theology requires an empty slate, an inerrant, infallible source, and careful adherence to this inductive method. Each of Chafer's listed

¹⁸ Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 8.

essentials relates to these three necessities. His lack in this chapter is an inadequate consideration of the empty slate. Development must be an iterative process, and every iteration must consider bias error added by previous orthodoxy. That is profound.

Review & Critique of Chafer's Chapter 2-9 Bibliology (21-124)

Bibliology is the the thorough systematic study of the doctrine of the Holy Bible. Not the doctrines of the Holy Bible; but the doctrine of the Holy Bible. Exactly what does one have in their mind when they hold the sixty six books of the Holy Bible, written by forty authors over a period of 1592 years?¹⁹ Chafer claims that such a study “falls naturally into seven divisions, namely”:²⁰

- (1) Revelation, chapter 11, detailed in 13 pages, 48-60
- (2) Inspiration, chapter 12, detailed in 28 pages, 61-88
- (3) Canonicity, chapter 13, detailed in 16 pages, 89-104
- (4) Illumination, chapter 14, detailed in 9 pages, 105-113
- (5) Interpretation, chapter 15, detailed in 5 ½ pages, 114-119
- (6) Animation, chapter 16, detailed in 3 ¼ pages, 120-123
- (7) Preservation, chapter 17, detailed in 1 ¼ pages, 124-125

Consider 1) that these are not natural divisions by any means, 2) that there is a total dismissal (and omission) of the preservation of the plenary verbally inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God, and 3) the “proof or disproof that the Bible is God's inerrant message to man”²¹ is dismissed from systematic theology, dismissed from

19 Moses came to Mount Sinai and John the last of the Apostles penned his last epistle in the close of the 1st century.

20 Ibid., 47.

21 Ibid., 21, para 1.

Bibliology, and placed into the hands of the Biblical Critic.

Chafer's Bibliology's Natural Divisions Are Not Natural

That Chafer has improperly organized his outline for Bibliology is obvious because Illumination and Preservation should be subcategories of Inspiration, and Interpretation and Animation have no part in Bibliology at all. The science of interpretation, called hermeneutics, has more to do with how we use Scripture than it does Bibliology, which is how we got, and what we have as Scripture. Such a doctrine is important, of course, but would find better organization in theology's consideration of how we properly build a systematic theology.

Charles Hodge, a most organized and systematic of theologians, does not even include a section called Bibliology. But he expertly words one in “The Protestant Rule of Faith”²² Therein he organizes his Bibliology as follows:

- 1) The statement of the doctrine and Canon, 2pgs, 151-152.
- 2) The Scriptures given by Inspiration of God, 20pgs, 153-171.
- 3) Adverse Theories (Rationalistic, Gracious Inspiration, Partial Inspiration) 10pgs 172-181.
- 4) Completeness of Scripture 6pgs 182-187.
- 5) Perspicuity of Scripture (clearly expressed and presented) 1pg 188.
- 6) Rules of Interpretation 1pg 199.

Another Presbyterian/Reformed Theologian, William Shedd organized his Systematic Theology with a section on Bibliology which was structured with:

- I) Revelation and Inspiration; 51 pages.

²² Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology: Volume I-IV* (Charles Scribner & Company, 1871), (Hardback-Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1940), 151.

- II) Authenticity of Scripture; 5 pages.
- III) Credibility of Scripture; 27 pages and
- IV) Canonicity of Scripture; 1 page.

Even John Miley, a nineteenth century Methodist Theologian, organized a thorough Bibliology in his Systematic Theology. His structure included:

- I) Threefold operation of the Spirit, 2 pages.
- II) Erroneous Theories of Inspiration, 4 pages.
- III) The Dynamical Theory, 1 page.
- IV) Inspiration and the Scriptures, 2 pages.

These hundred year old systematic theologies present a concise, clear, direct and authoritative presentation of Bibliology which centers solely on a solid Biblical explanation of Inspiration. Chafer has none of that.

Reasonable consideration is due to Dr. Chafer. His preface made it clear that his driving purpose was to set the record straight concerning dispensational theology. However, when the authority and inspiration of Scripture is under direct attack, when modernist contend that there is no inspired Bible in existence, all was lost with the demise of those original manuscripts. Dr. Chafer presents a wholly unorganized Bibliology, an indefinite, excessively wordy, pointless verbiage, and then He sings all four verses of the modernists theme song.. This lack of Bibliology effort by Chafer was such a frustration that a cleaned up and concise chapter needs to be worded in his stead. Appendix one of this effort shall constitute a draft of that Bibliology need.

Detailing the shortfalls of this crucial section called Bibliology must begin with Dr. Chafer's unclear introduction and side stepped responsibility. He begins with a staunch

and accurate declaration that “Systematic Theology must proceed on the bases of belief that the Bible is, in all its parts, God's own Word to man.”²³ And again, “the theologian must be a 'Biblicist' – one who is not only a Biblical scholar but also a *believer* in the divine character of each and every portion of the text of the Bible.”²⁴ And again, “the theologian is appointed to systematize the truth contained in the Bible and to view it as the divinely inspired Word which God has addressed to man.”²⁵

Chafer's Bibliology Is Fractured Badly

Despite the apparent directness of each of Dr. Chafer's charges here there is a fracture in each context which exposes his error. “The Bible is, in all its parts God's own Word to man.” The description “*the plenary verbally inspired, inerrant, infallible Word of God*” became the most complete, most thorough capture of the doctrine of Bibliology, and this description would be perfectly fitting in Dr. Chafer's concluding sentence; Dr. Chafer avoids its use entirely in this chapter. Why? This omission is symptomatic of a systematic failure in his Bibliology. In his preface Dr. Chafer establishes the challenge and value of detecting and exposing grand omissions from flawed systematic theologies. His detection of the completely omitted dispensational periods was his theme in that preface but in his Bibliology chapter he has completely omitted the defense of the plenary, (i.e. completely all) verbal, (i.e. every word) inspired, (i.e. God breathed) inerrant, (i.e. incapable of holding to error) infallible, (i.e. Incapable of ever failing) Word of God. (Scripture made up of words and these words are, every one, part and parcel, the words belonging to, and coming from, Jehovah God.) Let alone that Dr. Chafer never

23 Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 21.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

defined or defended this description, he never even addressed it: His omission is a slander to those who so gallantly defended it in years gone by, and a condoning of the modernist's allegation that “nobody today has an inspired Bible,” and the world's allegation that “there are three hundred versions and nobody knows what the Bible says.”

Secondly Dr. Chafer declares that “the theologian must be a Biblicist,”²⁶ but then in the same breath, he completely dismisses the theologian's responsibility to be that.

Examine if you will, this very wordy, subtle and round about dismissing sentence pair:

Primarily, the theologian is appointed to systematize the truth contained in the Bible and to view it as the divinely inspired Word which God has addressed to man. Therefore, such investigations as men may conduct in the field of proof or disproof that the Bible is God's inerrant message to man are, for the most part, extra theological and to be classified as pertaining to Biblical criticism rather than Systematic Theology.²⁷

There is an old double negative adage that comes to mind here: “Don't waist your time not diagramming this sentence.” It is appropriate here because it takes analytical effort to comprehend what is said by Dr. Chafer. (This problem with Chafer's writing style will be the subject in a later paragraph.)

Chafer here states that the theologian does not need to do Bibliology because he can trust the Biblical Critic to do it for him. All post modern Christendom is jeopardized when the president of Dallas Theological Seminary surrenders all Bibliology over to to the ecumenical modernist Bible critics in this fashion. It is appalling to read this declaration even when it is so verbose and carefully categorized with a guarded pen. First off, the theologian can not surrender their Bibliology to anybody and retain the

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.

position of theologian, especially when he is embarked on a calling to be systematic. But then to surrender to the Bible critic who vocally contends that there is no inspired Bible in existence, and if there ever was it went extinct the day its ink dried. Such surrender is worse than oversight, it is preposterous.

The modernist scholars vehemently deny this analogy but a Bible critic is first a critic. A movie critic picks apart a movie to find every flaw and shortcoming. A literary critic picks apart a prose to find every inadequate expression and faulty clause. A Bible critic, whether practicing *higher criticism* or *lower criticism* does not start out with a Bible founded belief in the plenary verbal inspiration of inerrant infallible Scripture. The job description of a critic is to find and expose the flaws and short comings. To trust the infallible Scriptures to such a job description is incorrigible. One cannot hold to plenary verbal inspiration while blessing the critic who is casting aside all the verbs that Catholic Saint Origen dropped out of his Alexandrian manuscripts²⁸. It seems that Origen carelessly omitted sections from his Bible, but Alexandria was man sanctioned as the international wisdom center of the world, and the corruptions may not be just careless. It is obvious that they sanctioned Origen's corrupted text and that corrupted text is passed on in the Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, the manuscripts inordinately preferred by W&H and all modernist textual critics.

The responsibility of Bibliology, the thorough study of how we got our Bible, and of what we are ever holding as our final authority, is squarely centered on the shoulders of the theologian who is compiling a systematic theology. Dr. Chafer did not do an adequate exploration of this very crucial doctrine.

²⁸ The Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus are manuscripts that came directly from Alexandria Egypt, where Origen (182-254 A.D.) was Father of Biblical Criticism, and Father of the Allegorical Method.

In his third declaration Chafer says the theologian is “to view (the truth of the Bible) as the divinely inspired word which God has addressed to man.” Again, this sounds solid enough at first, but it fractures horribly as his explanation progresses. What is omitted here is, again, the doctrine of the plenary, (each and every) verbal, (down to the individual word) inspiration (God breathes) of Scripture (all sixty-six books penned by forty authors over 1,592 years) Here Chafer only admits to the truths being inspired. Chafer lists four objections to verbal plenary inspiration, and, unfortunately, he leaves the last one unrefuted. Chafer's listed objection to the doctrine of inspiration is stated: “The claim for verbal, plenary inspiration is made only for the original writings and does not extend to any transcriptions or translations,”²⁹ That false objection continues: “It is also true that no original manuscript is now available.” Chafer admits these two statements as indisputable facts. Shame on him.

And then Chafer quotes Westcott and Hort, the textual critics who set aside all other manuscripts in favor of the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus manuscripts from Alexandria, Egypt, and Dr. Phillip Schaff, the chairman of the American Committee of the Revisers, but who state that their deletions won't really effect any major doctrines. Their omissions and or changing of 100,000 or 150,000 words, by Dr. Schaff's own count, does indeed effect a Biblical Doctrine, it effects the Biblical Doctrine of plenary verbal inspiration. They are changing those 100,000 words based on what Roman Catholic Saint Origen of Alexandria Egypt, Father of Textual Criticism, and Father of the Roman Catholic Allegorical Method, placed in his library copy. None of these modernist ecumenical infidels even stop to consider that maybe the Alexandrian family of texts

²⁹ Ibid., 87.

were all (i.e. both) corrupt! Only a little investigation by one believing in plenary verbal inspiration of inerrant, infallible, Scripture, demonstrates that these two outliers, which contradict thousands of Byzantine texts, are indeed the corrupted ones. Chafer backs away from this obvious solution and bows to majority opinions. Again, Shame on Dr. Chafer.

A second shortfall of Chafer's Bibliology section is his lack of systematic organization and structure of the section. Acknowledging Bibliology even before covering Theism, i.e. God's Existence, which is the more traditional first coverage of a Systematic Theology, is a strength, not a shortfall of Chafer, but his organization within this section itself is not adequate.

In his introduction to Bibliology there is an extensive introduction to the works of God, i.e. the seven dispensations of God and the twelve covenants of God; an introduction to the trinity; an introduction to types and anti-types; and an introduction to the structure of the Bible; but there is no introduction to Bibliology. Bibliology is not a study of all that the Bible says, it is a study of the Bible itself, i.e. the Scriptures, what they are, and how we got them. Chafer's Bibliology does have a wealth of information in it: all of it has a place in a systematic theology, but none of it, per se, belongs in a Bibliology introduction. A good introduction to Bibliology must include a definition of the study, a justification of the study, a preview of the doctrine, and a preview of the opposition to the doctrine. In other words an introduction needs to contain all that is to be in the body of the section. Chafer's introduction has none of that.

With no introduction to provide his direction or purpose in this section it can still be stated that thirteen pages of ramblings about revelation is not a proper start for

Bibliology. Very little of this information has place in a Bibliology section. Some of it might find a place in Prolegomena, intimating how information for systematic theology was initiated, but in the Bibliology section the infallible Scripture as the sole source for our Systematic Theology is the theme; ergo, revelation may be discussed in its role of providing Scripture, without expending significant effort on revelation as an entity in itself.

Further structural and organization problems with Chafer's Bibliology section are seen in his chapter divisions. Inspiration should be central with his chapters titled "Revelation", and "Illumination" as only subtitles. His "Preservation" is gutless and hollow. It should be greatly expanded to debunk the autograph tom-foolery, and his "Cannonicity and Authority" chapter should be bolstered with Biblical truths. Finally, his "Interpretation" and his "Animation" chapters have no place in a Bibliology section. It is likely that Dr. Chafer was trying for seven significant chapters to represent a completeness of the coverage, seven being God's number of completeness. Chafer often tries this tack. It was a folly here. This whole section needs to be thought out again, and given a suitable organization and coverage.

Lastly, in the critique of Dr. Chafer's Bibliology section, something must be said about his elaborated use of the English language. A politician often fails as a statesman because he applies the art of rambling on and answering not. A theologian is not systematic unless he can summarize concisely the symptoms, overview, source and use of mis-truth and/or half truth. "Listen" to his three concluding sentences on Bibliology –
Scriptures Preservation:

The Scriptures are the legal instrument by which God

obligates Himself to execute every detail of His eternal covenants and to fulfill every prediction His prophets have made. The legal instrument which secures this vast consummation must continue, and shall continue, until the last promise, for which it stands as surety, has been realized. Not one jot or tittle of the divine disposition can pass until all is fulfilled.³⁰

Does it not bother anyone else that some editor, perhaps secretary or typist, allowed these seventy words to be strung together and typed when, after analysis, they say nothing at all? Especially nothing about the preservation of God's verbally inspired, inerrant, infallible, words!

Granted, Dr. Chafer wanted this chapter on preservation to pass without providing any doctrinal clarification, and this verbose wording does the job. He has already surrendered authority to Westcott and Hort and their follow on teams of Bible critics, who took 1John 5:7 out of the Words of God. Not to mention taking their penknife out to cut out and throw away Mathew 17:21, 18:11; 23:14; Mark 7:16; 9:44, and 46; 11:26; 15:28. So too Luke 17:36; 23:17 and John 5:4. They trashed Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7; 28:29; Rom 16:24; as well. Bible Critics Westcott and Hort, followed by all ecumenical modernist translators actually did that! They also ripped out most of Matt 5:44 and Luke 9:56 and in Col 1:14 cut out the phrase "Through His Blood!" Chafer would find it pretty challenging to write an exposition on preservation or on Psalm 119:89 "LAMED. For ever, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven," or to detail what Christ meant about jot and tittle preservation when you let the textual critics, who do not believe in an inerrant, infallible, inspired Bible, toss aside 349 words from these twenty verses alone!

In this chapter Dr. Chafer has taken an ability to say nothing concrete in his very long sentences, to a whole new level. It is good English, but bad writing and faulty

³⁰ Ibid., 125.

Systematic Theology.

L. Gaussen worded the seriousness of this subject thus:

I do not think that, after we have come to know that Christianity is divine, there can be presented to our mind any question bearing more essentially on the vitality of our faith than this: 'Does the Bible come from God? is it altogether from God? or may it not be true, as some have maintained, that there occurs in it maxims purely human, statements not exactly true, exhibitions of Vulgar ignorance and ill-sustained reasoning? in a word, books, or portions of books, foreign to the interest of the faith, subject to the natural weakness of the writers judgment, and alloyed with error?' Here we have a question that admits on no compromise, a fundamental question, a question of life! It is the first that confronts you on opening the Scriptures, and with it your religion ought to commence.³¹

Still, Dr. Chafer and Dr. Thiessen contend that Westcott and Hort were perfectly justified in removing these 349 words from our Bible, and indeed many many more in their total criticism. They contend that ripping these verses out of the Bible, i.e. all of Mathew 17:21, 18:11; 23:14; Mark 7:16; 9:44, and 46; 11:26; 15:28, Luke 17:36; 23:17, John 5:4, Acts 8:37; 15:34; 24:7, 28:29, Rom 16:24, will not modify or detract from our faith at all. This grotesque compromise of faith and fidelity has rendered Dr. Chafer incapable of defining a doctrine of inspiration, canonization, and preservation. and has indeed rendered his whole section entitled "Bibliology" feckless.

³¹ L. Gaussen, *Theopneustia – The plenary Inspiration of The Holy Scriptures deduced from Internal Evidence, and the Testimonies of Nature, History and Science* (David Scott's translation, Chicago, The Bible Institute Colportage ASS'N., 1840), 5-6.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 10-13 Theology Proper (129-180)

A common failure of our documented systematic theologies is their propensity to systematically explore orthodox and/or traditional doctrines which have no scriptural bases whatsoever. Naturalistic Theism encompasses exactly such a feckless exercise.

For one whole chapter of twenty five pages Dr. Chafer waxes very philosophical and very, very verbose in trying to decipher what mankind could know about the existence of God, without the presence of God's revelation to man. This theologian's immediate response; "Who cares?" Our more pressing reaction should be "What does God's written Word tell us of man's intrinsic knowledge about God, and man's standing before Him?" A discussion of ontological arguments logically assembled by philosophers of yesteryear has no place whatsoever in a systematic theology. Arguing for or against the existence of reality, categorizing universal characteristics of existence and explaining "I think therefore I am," is a sophomoric exercise for a philosophy student, or cultist's ground for Mary Baker Glover Eddy's Christian-Science reading room, but not the sacred ground for the theologian with a Holy Bible in his lap.

Likewise twenty two wordy paragraphs defining a teleological *aposterior* argument which proves the existence of God is nothing more than philosophical fodder with no founded place in a systematic theology. Supposing a power which produces intelligence and rational thought might somehow lack intelligence and rational thought is such a profound tom-foolery that it should not even be named *theological*, let alone find seven whole pages in a systematic theology book. In his own conclusion Dr. Chafer admits that such "abstract speculations" are completely unnecessary.³²

³² Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 161.

Dr. Chafer does include two necessary arguments about man's intrinsic knowledge of God; the cosmological argument and the anthropological argument. But even in these his development is wholly philosophical and completely lacking for the theologian, even categorically incompetent for a systematic theologian. A competent cosmological argument and a competent anthropological argument must start where the Word of God starts, and not where the vain logical philosophies of mere men starts. The theologian must, as heretofore stated by all parties, begin with an infallible, inerrant source and unravel what has been revealed about Naturalistic Theism. Such a volume must first cast off all of Hodge, Strong, Thiessen and Chafer's Ontological-Teleological arguments as vain philosophy. There are two and only two pertinent books that fill their pages with philosophy; Job and Ecclesiastes. Neither of them contain ontological or teleological considerations. Why? Both of these philosophy dissertations begin and revolve around what Scripture reveals as man's intrinsic knowledge about God. Ergo a systematic theology presenting Naturalistic Theism must begin with nothing more and should venture through none of the rationalistic mud of unregenerate philosophers. Chafer's whole chapter needs to be reorganized and rewritten. Just such a venture is begun in the appendix of this report.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 14 The Attributes of God (187-224)

Chapter 14 of Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's Systematic Theology disqualifies him as a candidate for writing a theology book, and it thoroughly and completely disqualifies him for writing a systematic theology. In this chapter, titled "The Attributes of God", a crescendo of improper, unsystematic organization crosses a line of incompetence where his scattered ramblings cannot be rationally comprehended. In this chapter needing concise conclusions about our God and Father, passive communication methods cross a threshold in ones ability to comprehend his subject, his verb and the possible existence of indirect objects. In this Chapter where the heart of theology resides one cannot find sound Biblical Doctrine, Biblical research methods or Biblical hermeneutics. These observations make Chafer's six volume set uncomfortable in an independent Baptist theologians library.

There three glaring failures in Chafer's systematic theology; his failure to organize a presentation of doctrine, his failure to communicate anything in an active voice and a concise English sentence, and his failure to comprehend and capture a purely Biblical theology, necessitate the review of more competent systematic works, and makes obvious the dire need of a purely Biblical systematic theology work captured in something less than six volumes.

Three more competent systematic works capture a profound insight to the attributes of God and surely capture a more thoroughly organized systematic theology. Dr. Chafer's lack genders a new respect of Augustus H. Strong. A strong attraction is in his Baptist heritage; Baptist historically being people of the Book, i.e. people with the Holy Bible as a final authority and the being a sole authority of all faith and practice, ergo, people who

defy creeds, traditions, and human founders, to rest solely on this one authority.

Augustus Strong exhibits genius in organizing and communicating Bible doctrine and systematic theology. His organization captures the attributes of God as the first chapter of Part IV of his first volume. That part entitled “The nature, decrees, and works of God.”³³

Chafer's whole section titled Bibliology, needed to be re-written to incorporate a Biblical view of inspiration; his whole chapter of “Naturalistic Theism,” needed to be re-written to capture any Biblical view at all; and now, his chapter on the attributes, personality and works of God is found to be in such unorganized, excessively passive and verbose conglomeration that it too needs to be re-written. Such a re-write, following Augustus Strong's superb example is begun in Appendix 3 of this report.

Henry Clarence Thiessen is the other Baptist author of a Systematic Theology. His organization and writing is far superior to Chafer's. His one volume called “Introductory Lectures In Systematic Theology” incorporates a very concise and careful wording of doctrine, where Chafer exhibits six volumes of verbose imprecise wording of the same. Both seem to equally capture evangelical error, with an un-Biblical doctrine of inspiration, naturalistic theology, and of the decrees of God, but Thiessen is greatly preferred to the excessively passive and verbose mannerisms of Dr. Chafer.

Dr. Thiessen divided his Theism from his Theology, as did Strong, and he organized the latter as: 1) The Nature of God- Essence and Attributes, 2) The Nature of God- The Unity and Trinity, 3) The Decrees of God, 4) The Works of God in Sovereignty. Such a work mimics the organization structure and content of Strong and makes a worthy

³³ Strong's Volume is organized in four parts; 1) Prolegomena, 2) The Existence of God, 3) The Scriptures A Revelation From God, 4) The Nature, Decrees and Works of God.

outline for a re-write of Chafer's vain attempt.

Charles Hodge,(1797-1878) in a perfectly thorough systematic theology, by a perfectly thorough, albeit Presbyterian, theologian, organized his Theology Proper as: 1) Origin of the idea of God, 2) Theism, 3) Anti-Theistic theories, 4) knowledge of God, 5) The Nature of God and His Attributes, 6) the Trinity, 7) The Divinity of Christ, 8) The Holy Spirit, 9) The Decrees of God, 10) Creation, 11) Providence, and 12) Miracles. For the area of Theology Proper it would be hard to improve on Hodges Systematic approach. Strong seems to be the first to separate Theism from Theology and that separation is artificial and unnecessary. Where each theologian should have expounded the Bibles Dispensationology, under the works of God, alas none have. A special disappointment is hailed for Chafer, who started with a burning desire to word dispensationalism but had no depth to include it under the works of God. Instead all these theologians spent exorbitant time defending the Westminster confession and its fatalistic heresy; that decrees everything that happens and knew who you'd marry before the foundation of the earth!³⁴ that God knows every soul that shall be saved and decreed it before the foundation of the earth!³⁵ and that God knows every soul headed to hell and predestined them to go there before the foundation of the earth!³⁶

Hodge, the Presbyterian, worshiper of John Calvin, made his Systematic Theology systematically Westminster, and loyal to Roman diabolical philosophies. Strong,

34 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 1. God from all eternity, did, by the most wise and holy counsel of His own will, freely, and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass ...

35 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 3-4, III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life; and others foreordained to everlasting death. IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated, and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished.

36 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 3-4, Previously quoted from <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/creeds/wcf.htm> accessed 09/05/2013.

bolstered the deity of Christ in his, but retained the Westminster confession without correction, and would not depart from vain philosophy. Thiessen departed from inspiration of Scripture, but not from the Westminster Confession or philosophical viewpoints. And Chafer added unmitigated wordiness to Thiessen, bolstered the denial of plenary verbal inspiration, infallibility and inerrancy, while bowing the more loyally to the Westminster as he spinelessly regurgitated the philosophical perspectives; perspectives incorporated by Roman Catholics and carried on by Protestants who did not protest enough. It is high time that someone with a systems background and a solid grasp on an infallible inerrant sole authority, defy the Westminster Confession of 1646, defy the philosopher and define a Biblical Systematic Theology. Alas Chafer is not that man.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 15 Divine Decrees (pg. 225-259)

A supposition about Dr. Lewis Sperry Chafer's competence in writing a Systematic Theology is worded previously but a comment on his thirty five pages defending the Westminster Confession's divine decrees is in order here. He starts by asserting that anyone who would disagree with the Westminster's interpretation is “dishonoring and misleading.”³⁷ He contends that since both the Westminster Confession of 1646 and the Bible assert the *decree*, the *purpose*, the *determinate counsel*, the *foreknowledge*, the *foreordination*, and the *election* by which God is said to act, therefore the Westminster Confession of 1646 is the truth. Incidentally, it reports as truth that God decrees everything that happens and knew who you'd marry before the foundation of the earth!³⁸ that God knows every soul that shall be saved and decreed it before the foundation of the earth!³⁹ and that God knows every soul headed to hell and predestined them to go there before the foundation of the earth!⁴⁰

Dr. Chafer then rambles on and on for thirty three pages before he allows a Rev. Alex Brown to write his misguided conclusion.⁴¹ Dr. Chafer is provided a perfect convenience for writing out his dispensational theology in a section about the works of God, instead of writing about the actual works of God he expands and justifies the Roman Catholic myth, worded by John Calvin, codified in the Westminster Confession of 1646, perpetuated by Presbyterians, certified by Reformed Theologians, and presently

37 Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 225.

38 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 1, Previously quoted from <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/creeds/wcf.htm> accessed 09/05/2013.

39 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 3-4, III, Previously quoted from <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/creeds/wcf.htm> accessed 09/05/2013.

40 Westminster Confession of Faith (1646) Chap III, Article 3-4, Previously quoted from <http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/creeds/wcf.htm> accessed 09/05/2013.

41 Chafer, *Systematic Theology Vol. 1*, 257-259.

creeping in to non-Protestant (i.e. Baptists) theology, the myth of divine decrees.

Someone needs to accentuate the old relevant story and declare in no uncertain terms, “The Emperor has NO clothes.”⁴²

I hold in my hands a Bible that declares, Prayer changes things, and they hold in their systematic theologies that, All is foreknown, nothing can change. One is wrong. I hold in my hands a Bible that says, “It repented God that He had made man”, that God repented of what he was going to do to Nineveh, and that God and I can change the eternal destiny of my neighbor, and they write a systematic theology that says “nay, nay.” I hold in my lap a book that says Sarah gave Hagar to Abram and mucked up a situation with obtuse consequences; they say God planned it that way from the foundation of the world. I hold a book that says Abraham intervened for Lot and caused his salvation, they say God would have done it that way anyhow. My Bible says Moses intervened to prevent God from destroying the Sons of Israel, they say God was just pulling Moses' leg with false threats. My Bible says Joash only had three victories because he only struck his arrows three times, their decrees say God didn't rearrange his plan he just deceived old Elisha and Joash. My book says God changed his minded, God changed his Word, and God changed his message just to give Hezekiah thirteen more years of life; they say he was just messing with Elisha and Hezekiah's head. It is high time somebody stood up to these dishonoring deceivers and plainly declared that the Westminster Confession is WRONG! One is responsible for their own actions, decisions, and rejections, and God does pay attention to the whosoever of the Bible. Again, Dr. Chafer proved not to be that man.

42 Reference to short story *Emperor's New Clothes*, 1837, by Hans Christian Anderson.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 16 The Names of Deity (260-271)

Chafer worded an excellent chapter on The Names of Deity. There is a distinct break from his very wordy, excessively philosophical style previously displayed. He emphasized in this chapter that the Scriptures were his main source. This had not been mentioned or practiced previous. It made all the difference in the world. The concise wording seems to be accomplished by citing other works heavily, but it was a joy to read a concise well worded chapter. Evidently he wrote his own conclusion, that is the only portion that reminded me of his disturbing style.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 17-19 Trinitarianism (272-317)

Chafer's Trinitarianism was reviewed. It was disturbing that Chafer worded this thirty nine word sentence, "The fact that men of equal sincerity disagree relative to the possibility of reason serving in the field of this doctrine is evidence that unaided human minds fail in their attempts to search the deep things of God," which highlights his insufficiency to word a concise definitive section on the trinitarian doctrine. Again Strong is far more capable as a theologian in this area. Chafer outlines his section as follows:

Chapter 17 Introduction to Trinitarianism

Chapter 18 Proof of the Trinitarian Doctrine

Chapter 19 God the Father

Chapter 20-26 God the Son

I. His Preexistence

II. His Names

III. His Deity

IV. His Incarnation

V. His Humanity

VI. The Kenosis

VII. The Hypostatic Union

Chapter 27 God the Holy Spirit

While Strong has this detailed and clarified presentation of the doctrine:

Chapter II. Doctrine of the Trinity, 304-352

I. In Scripture there are Three who are recognized as God, 305-322

1. Proofs from the New Testament, 305-317

A. The Father is recognized as God, 305

B. Jesus Christ is recognized as God, 305-315

- C. The Holy Spirit is recognized as God, 315-317
- 2. Intimations of the Old Testament, 317-322
 - A. Passages which seem to teach Plurality of some sort in the Godhead, 317-319
 - B. Passages relating to the Angel of Jehovah, . . . 319-320
 - C. Descriptions of the Divine Wisdom and Word, 320-321
 - D. Descriptions of the Messiah, 321-322
- II. These Three are so described in Scripture, that we are compelled to conceive them as distinct Persons, 322-326
 - 1. The Father and the Son are Persons distinct from each other, 322
 - 2. The Father and the Son are Persons distinct from the Spirit, 322-323
 - 3. The Holy Spirit is a Person, 323-326
- III. This Tri-personality of the Divine Nature is not merely economic and temporal, but is immanent and eternal, 326-330
 - 1. Scripture Proof that these distinctions of Personality are eternal, 326
 - 2. Errors refuted by the Scripture Passages, . . . 327-330
 - A. The Sabellian, 327-328
 - B. The Arian, 328-330
- VI While there are three Persons, there is but one Essence, 330-334
- V. These three Persons are Equal, 334-343
 - 1. These Titles belong to the Persons, 334-336
 - 2. Qualified Sense of these Titles, 335-340
 - 3. Generation and Procession consistent with Equality, 340-343
- VI. The Doctrine of the Trinity inscrutable, yet not self-contradictory, but the Key to all other Doctrines, 344-352
 - 1. The Mode of this Triune Existence is inscrutable, 344-345
 - 2. The Doctrine of the Trinity is not self-contradictory, 345-347
 - 3. The Doctrine of the Trinity has important relations to other Doctrines, 347-352

Dr. Chafer's extremely wordy, improperly organized section on the trinity is dwarfed by existing systematic theology works.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 20-26 God The Son (318-395)

Dr. Chafer's extremely wordy, improperly organized section on the Christology is dwarfed by existing systematic theology works.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Chapter 27 God the Holy Spirit (397-413)

Dr. Chafer's extremely wordy, improperly organized section on the The Holy Spirit is dwarfed by existing systematic theology works.

Review and Critique of Chafer's Volume 1 Conclusion

Appendix 1 A Proper Bibliology (First Draft)

The word *Bibliology* is derived from two Greek words, *Biblios* and *logos*. The former, of course, is *a book, a scroll, and/or a written document* and the latter a *word, a discourse, a doctrine, a teaching, a matter under discussion, a thing spoken of or talked about, also the mental faculty of thinking, meditating, or reasoning about*. Others have limited this suffix by equating it to the English word *science*, which is “The observation, identification, description, experimental investigation, and theoretical explanation of phenomena.”⁴³ There really is no English equivalent that can capture the depth of *ology* in *Bibliology*. This, of course, is true for theology, soteriology and all the other *ologies* that are encountered in a Systematic Theology. Ergo, a Bibliology shall be thorough.

Such a thorough study is pertinent. Plenary, verbal inspiration, infallibility, and inerrancy of Scripture has been under continual and diabolical attack since God first uttered Word to man. Good men, with powerful pens have well defined the doctrine of inspiration and preservation, and have staunchly rebuked the diabolical attacks that have reared up in their day. The definitions and defenses which they put forth are to be recited here. In our present day, however, there has been a new and overwhelming falling away from the doctrine of inspiration and preservation. The compromise has engulfed all of Dallas Theological Seminary, and impacted all of *Evangelical Christendom*. The compromise has been swallowed up by Los Angeles Baptist Bible Seminary, (now become Masters College) and has invaded every Baptist Church. The compromise is this: “Only the Original Manuscripts, called *Autographs*, were inspired, inerrant, and

43 American Heritage Dictionary, 3rd ed., s.v. “Science.”

infallible,” they say. “The *autographs* are long gone and there is no inspired, inerrant, infallible copy of the Bible in existence,” they say. Good Christians have been persuaded by artful, but gainsaying salesman to set aside the Words of God and pick up a bible cut and assembled, crafted and copyright by international ecumenical modernists who never did believe in the doctrine of inspiration and preservation.

A new chapter of Bibliology needs to be penned. The Bible colleges and seminaries of our day are swallowed in this compromise and will not write it. A significant portion of this work is used to expose the diabolical compromise which in these last of the last days is engulfing Christendom and leading honest God fearing Christians down the dangerous path of compromise.

INSPIRATION

The inspiration of Scripture is the very heart of Bibliology, but in the larger sense it is the kingpin of all theology, yeah all Christianity. In the 1800's L. Gaussen, Professor of Systematic Theology, Geneva Switzerland, worded this truth thus:

I do not think that, after we have come to know that Christianity is divine, there can be presented to our mind any question bearing more essentiality on the vitality of our faith than this: 'Does the Bible come from God? is it altogether from God? or may it not be true, as some have maintained, that there occurs in it maxims purely human, statements not exactly true, exhibitions of Vulgar ignorance and ill-sustained reasoning? in a word, books, or portions of books, foreign to the interest of the faith, subject to the natural weakness of the writers judgment, and alloyed with error?' Here we have a question that admits on no compromise, a fundamental question, a question of life! It is the first that confronts you on opening the Scriptures, and with it your religion

ought to commence.⁴⁴

With an uncompromised answer to these questions our whole theology ought to commence.

Inspiration Defined

πασα γραφή θεόπνευστος

It is worth exploring the original Bible languages to full comprehend why the seventy seven highly skilled linguists employed and paid by King James from 1603 through 1611 translated this Greek phrase “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God.” The English word *inspiration* carefully avoided by each ecumenical modernist bible translator, incorporates in its definition breath of life, influence and stimulation of mind, feeling emotion to produce an activity, as well as incorporating the word spirit. Indeed the English word *inspiration* is formed and framed around the concept contained in the Greek *theopneustia*. There is no better English capture of this concept. God created and breathed out the very wording of every sentence of what is written down as Scripture.

Although there is only one use of the Greek word for inspiration found in the Bible, the teams of translators funded by King James found another exact match in the Hebrew of the Old Testament Scripture. It is insightful to this argument. The Scripture is Job 32:8, “But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration(Strong# 05397, Hebrew נְשִׁמָּה *nesh-aw-maw*) of the Almighty giveth them understanding.” In context this is the opening argument of the younger Elihu, clarifying that despite his junior status, he has some pertinent insights from God about the status of Job. He goes on to expound this

⁴⁴ Gaussen, *Theopneustia*, 5-6

unrefuted understanding for 165 verses in six chapters of the book of Job. The Hebrew word *nesh-aw-maw*, translated breath, 17 times, blast, thrice, and spirit, twice, is here translated *inspiration*. The English word, the Hebrew linguistic and present context, incorporates both breath and spirit: the breath of God and the spirit of man. This remarkable insight, of the KJV translators and first use of the English word *inspiration* is completely eliminated by all ecumenical modernist English bibles, despite the fact that the word *inspiration* was invented for this very purpose. One must ask, “Why? the very word designed to fit into 2 Timothy 3:16, was rejected by the English translators of the RSV, NIV, ASV, NASV, NEV, RNEV et.al.? Such investigation will reveal that these translators were more concerned about securing lucrative copyrights than they were about clarity and exactness of their ecumenical translation.

Thus far we have entertained the linguistics of the word *inspiration*, and its avoidance by copyright conscious translators, but have not given it a thorough definition. Inspiration is a miracle and its definition must entail explanation of what and how the miracle unfolds. Such a definition is beyond the scope of the knowledge of the finite and no one better captures this conundrum than does Gaussen.

This miraculous operation of the Holy Ghost had not the sacred writers themselves for its object - for these were only his instruments, and were soon to pass away; but that its objects were the holy books themselves, which were destined to reveal from age to age, to the Church, the counsels of God, and which were never to pass away.

The power then put forth on those men of God, and of which they themselves were sensible only in very different degrees, has not been precisely defined to us. Nothing authorizes us to explain it. Scripture has never presented either its manner or its measure as an object of study. What it offers to our faith is solely the inspiration of what

TH 801 Advanced Systematic Theology Written Report

they say - the divinity of the book they have written. In this respect it recognizes no difference among them. What they say, they tell us, is theopneustic: their book is from God. Whether they recite the mysteries of a past more ancient than the creation, or those of a future more remote than the coming again of the Son of man, or the eternal counsels of the Most High, or the secrets of man's heart, or the deep things of God - whether they describe their own emotions, or relate what they remember, or repeat contemporary narratives, or copy over genealogies, or make extracts from uninspired documents - their writing is inspired, their narratives are directed from above; it is always God who speaks, who relates, who ordains or reveals by their mouth, and who, in order to this, employs their personality in different measures: for "the Spirit of God has been upon them," it is written, "and his word has been upon their tongue." And though it be always the word of man, since they are always men who utter it, it is always, too, the word of God, seeing that it is God who superintends, employs, and guides them. They give their narratives, their doctrines, or their commandments, "not with the words of man's wisdom, but with the words taught by the Holy Ghost;" and thus it is that God himself has not only put his seal to all these facts, and constituted himself the author of all these commands, and the revealer of all these truths, but that, further, he has caused them to be given to his Church in the order, and in the measure, and in the terms which he has deemed most suitable to his heavenly purpose.

Were we asked, then, how this work of divine inspiration has been accomplished in the men of God, we should reply, that we do not know; that it does not behove us to know; and that it is in the same ignorance, and with a faith quite of the same kind, that we receive the doctrine of the new birth and sanctification of a soul by the Holy Ghost. We believe that the Spirit enlightens that soul, cleanses it, raises it, comforts it, softens it. We perceive all these effects; we admire and we adore the cause; but we have found it our duty to be content never to know the means by which this is done. Be it the same, then,

with regard to divine inspiration.⁴⁵

There is little more to be said about what inspiration is, and if more is desired, Gausson has an additional and thorough 360, 150 year old, public domain pages on the doctrine of inspiration alone. This amount of definition is fully adequate for the completion of a systematic theology which hangs on the verbal plenary, inerrant, infallible, inspired word of God for its sole authority.

To fully satisfy the need, however, allow Gausson to express some additional and insightful thoughts on what the inspired authors experienced:

And were we, further, called to say at least what the men of God experienced in their bodily organs, in their will, or in their understandings, while engaged in tracing the pages of the sacred book, we should reply, that the powers of inspiration, were not felt by all to the same degree, and that their experiences were not at all uniform; but we might add, that the knowledge of such a fact bears very little on the interests of our faith, seeing that, as respects that faith, we have to do with the book, and not with the man. It is the book that is inspired, and altogether inspired: to be assured of this ought to satisfy us.⁴⁶

Inspiration of ALL SCRIPTURE

Several things are cleared up and nailed down in this single sentence of Scripture.

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof,

45 Ibid., 24-26

46 Ibid., 26

for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.” (2Tim 3:16-17) Consider two things about “all Scripture.” A lawyer, Dr. Gipp, once clarified that “All means *all* and that's all *all* means.” Ergo there is not a verse, thought, concept or phrase that is left out of the *all*. Dr. Thiessen, a Baptist theologian, committed sacrilege when he said that 1Thes 5:23⁴⁷ was only Paul's opinion⁴⁸. He was trying to defend his unbiblical belief that the human is only made up of the material and the immaterial. That is what excellent philosophers had taught the Roman Catholic clergy and Dr. Thiessen would not let go of that doctrine no matter what the Bible said about body, soul, and spirit. Indeed, contending that sometimes Paul only added his opinions in his writings is a categorical denial of the “all” in “all Scripture.”

Second, consider that this “all Scripture,” must include the writings of Moses, who penned the Pentateuch, collected in the 5 books the Hebrews called the *Torah*⁴⁹, Job who previously penned the spic Hebrew poetry book bearing his name, collected in the 13 books the Hebrews called the *Writings*⁵⁰, and Isaiah, who penned his prophetic book 750 years after Moses and 750 years before Christ. His book, Isaiah, is collected in the 21 books the Hebrews called the *Prophets*⁵¹. Young Timothy who was the recipient of the instruction penned in 2Tim 3:16, had no access to the original manuscripts, or

47 “And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

48 Henry Clarence Thiessen, *Lectures in Systematic Theology* (Eerdmans, 1949), 227, “In the second place, Paul seems to think of body, soul, and spirit as three distinct parts of man's nature (1Thes 5:23)”

49 The Hebrew Torah containing the 5 books – Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.

50 The Hebrew Writings containing the 13 books - 1Chronicles, 2Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah.

51 The Hebrew Prophets containing the 21 books - Joshua, Judges, 1Samuel, 2Samuel, 1Kings, 2Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

autographs, of these Scriptures. All young Timothy could have had were copies of copies of copies; none were 1,492 years old, as were the Torah and Writings, none were 750 years old, as were the Prophets, none, other than possibly the letter he held in his hand, were autographs, and yet all were inspired, all were profitable for doctrine, all were profitable for reproof, all were profitable for correction, all were profitable for instruction in righteousness. It defies good logic or sound reason that just in the last hundred years, *scholars*, so called, have convinced Christians, so called, that only autographs were inspired, only autographs were infallible, and only autographs were inerrant. Shame on Dr. Chafer and Dallas Theological Seminary for accepting such a position. Shame on Dr. Thiessen for promoting such a position in Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary. It is just as well that they dropped the Baptist title and became Dr. John MacArthur's Master's Seminary⁵². This brazen compromise on what inspiration is all about, has opened a flood gate of compromised Bible copyright mongers who have perverted His Words in every conceivable way, and yet they find general acceptance in Evangelical Christianity. They have even infiltrated Independent Baptist Churches with their evil compromise.

(blue comp book 3rd section pg 11)

52 The Master's College was founded as Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary on May 25, 1927 to meet the need for a fundamentalist Baptist school on the West Coast. The intention was to provide a biblical and Christcentered education consistent with those doctrines of the historic Christian faith. Dr. William A. Matthews, pastor of Memorial Baptist Church of Los Angeles, became the founder and first president. The seminary was extended an invitation to be temporarily housed at Calvary Baptist Church in the Los Angeles area. Several more moves followed until the seminary moved onto its own property in Los Angeles in 1942. Dr. Mathews died at his home on August 18, 1943. He was succeeded by presidents C. Gordon Evanson, Floyd Burton Boice, and **Henry C. Thiessen**. In 1946, the seminary became a graduate-level school and initiated a separate undergraduate and liberal arts program. **Following Dr. Thiessen's death in 1947**, Dr. Herbert V. Hotchkiss and Dr. Milton E. Fish, a Harvard graduate, strengthened the school scholastically and spiritually. August 14, 1959 marked a change, as Dr. John R. Dunkin became president, succeeding Dr. Carl M. Sweazy, who returned to full-time evangelism. The new president continued the scriptural position of the school's leadership. From: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Master's_College, although wikipedia is not a trusted source for citing one's research it was the only available source that revealed Dr. Thiessen as a past president of Master's College.

Appendix 2 A Proper Naturalistic Theism (First Draft)

What does man know about God with no exposure to the Scriptures wherein God reveals himself? The study and analysis of that question is called *naturalistic theism* because man by his nature knows of the existence of God. I times past otherwise genius theologians have left their Biblical mooring and ventured into rationalistic thinking and philosophical journals and made naturalistic theism some sort of rational proof of the existence of God. A wise theologian assembling a valid systematic theology must be ever vigilant and circumspect to stay secured in his Biblical moorings and answer naturalistic theism by analyzing, “What does the Bible say about mans natural and intrinsic knowledge of God?” That analysis will always be all sufficient for the systematic theologian.

In that other works of systematic theology have invested great effort in a rationalistic approach to naturalistic theism, their arguments are herein introduced, found baseless and philosophical and then found more adequately answered in Scripture. It is caprice that any theologian, Hodge, pg 204-207, Chafer, pg. 158-168, and particularly a Baptist theologian, Strong, pg 85-89, Thiessen, pg. 55-63, would spend effort analyzing an *ontological* argument for the existence of God. Ontology is the branch of philosophy, or metaphysics, which deals with the nature of being and the existence of reality. When Moses was nervous about the existence of God, God said to Moses, “I AM THAT I AM: and he said, Thus shall thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you.” (Exod 3:14) God spends no time, effort or word in proving the existence of His being or the existence of reality, and it is caprice for a theologian to pursue the vain philosophies of man down the vein of ontology.

It is equally vain to incorporate a *teleological* philosophy lecture in a systematic theology. Supposing that an ultimate purpose and design proves the existence of God is trite. God does not use their verbose volumes but presents His teleological argument in four redundant questions: “He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? he that formed the eye, shall he not see? He that chastiseth the heathen, shall not he correct? he that teacheth man knowledge, shall not he know?” (Psalm 94:9-10) This, God's profound acknowledgment of their whole teleological argument, is not given to the saint or theologian! The verses preceding says “Yet they say, The LORD shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard it. Understand, ye brutish among the people: and ye fools, when will ye be wise?” (vr. 7-8) For the systematic theologian to set aside his task of systematizing truth, and pursue a proof of the existence of God to a group of unregenerate vain philosophers is worse than vain, it is unadulterated foolishness. The whole point to this teleological proof text (i.e. Psalm 94:7-11) is the “The LORD knoweth the thought of man, that they are vanity.” (vr. 11) Ergo the theologian has no business wandering in the corridors of vain philosophy, nor attempting the proof of God's existence. If God himself does not dabble in the proof, neither will the wise.

This teleological proof text (Psalm 94:7-11) rests in this context; “Blessed is the man whom thou chastenest, O LORD, and teachest him out of thy law; That thou mayest give him rest from the days of adversity, until the pit be digged for the wicked.” (Psa 94:12-13) God's *law*, our pure source text for theology is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness,” (2Tim 3:16-17) and the brutish philosophers have the ear, the eye, the chastisement, and the teaching of knowledge (Psa 94:9-10) The parallels are not coincidental but the theologian should stay in his own

camp.

Hodge, Strong, and Chafer also appeal to an anthropological argument and a cosmological argument in their effort to provide the vain, brutish philosopher a proof of the existence of God. Indeed analyzing the constitution of man may reveal some characteristics of God, for man is after all made in His image, and analyzing the constitution of the universe will reveal the glory of God and can reveal his handiwork, exactly as Psalm 19 points out. However, again, the theologian that uses these entities to make a proof for the existence of God is not wise, and is not following a Biblical Systematic Theology. Just as Psalm 94 point the wise theologian to the perfect law of the LORD for his source of truth, so to does Psalm 19. It opens with a profound cosmological argument, but it has for its theme:

The law of the LORD is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the LORD is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the LORD are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the LORD is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the LORD are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping of them there is great reward. (Psalm 19:7-11)

To determine what natural man knows about God naturally the theologian should set aside all his philosophy books and look only into that perfect, sure, right, and pure sole source of theology: God's plenary, verbally inspired, infallible, inerrant Word.

Naturalistic Theism, what man knows about God naturally, what man intrinsically understands about God, is spelled out in God's Word. God's Word was already declared as the sole authority of all faith and practice, ergo the supreme source for our naturalistic theism. It says... (blue composition book section II pg10)

Appendix 3 A Proper Theology Proper (First Draft)

A systematic theology section titled “Theology Proper” is want to be written. One which captures all the organization of Charles Hodge and all the detail of Augustus Strong, while avoiding, yeah even exposing all the error of Westminster decrees. One which instead details the dispensations in the works of God. One which exposes the evolutionary blunder and glorifies him in detailing his wondrous work of creation. A systematic theology that has Holy Scripture as its soul authority and exposes the vain philosophies of man. Such a work is want to be made.

Excellent organizations of theologies have gone before. Hodge, is best organized, Strong is most detailed. Both are shown here and should be merged for completeness in a thorough and sound work.

Charles Hodge organized his Theology Proper thus: 1) Origin of the idea of God, 2) Theism, 3) Anti-Theistic theories, 4) knowledge of God, 5) The Nature of God and His Attributes, 6) the Trinity, 7) The Divinity of Christ, 8) The Holy Spirit, 9) The Decrees of God, 10) Creation, 11) Providence, and 12) Miracles.

Augustus Strong had a more detailed and slightly variant organization of his theology proper. It is in the block quote below:

PART IV. ”THE NATURE, DECREES, AND WORKS OF GOD, 243-370
Chapter I. The Attributes of God, 243-303
I. Definition of the term Attributes, 244
II. Relation of the Divine Attributes to the Divine Essence, 244-246
III. Methods of Determining the Divine Attributes, 246-247
IV. Classification of the Attributes, 247-249
V. Absolute or Immanent Attributes, 249-275
 First Division. Spirituality, and Attributes therein involved, 249-254
 1. Life, 251-252
 2. Personality, 252-254
 Second Division. Infinity, and Attributes therein involved, 254-260

1. Self-existence, 256-257
 2. Immutability, 257-259
 3. Unity, 259-260
 - Third Division. Perfection, and Attributes therein involved, 260-275
 1. Truth, 260-262
 2. Love, 263-268
 3. Holiness, 268-275
 - VI. Relative or Transitive Attributes, 275-295
 - First Division. Attributes having relation to Time and Space, 275-279
 1. Eternity, 275-278
 2. Immensity, 278-279
 - Second Division. Attributes having relation to Creation 279-288
 1. Omnipresence, 279-282
 2. Omniscience, 282-286
 3. Omnipotence, 286-288
 - Third Division. Attributes having relation to Moral Beings, 288-295
 1. Veracity and Faithfulness, or Transitive Truth, 288-289
 2. Mercy and Goodness, or Transitive Love, . . . 289-290
 3. Justice and Righteousness, or Transitive Holiness, 290-295
 - VII. Rank and Relations of the several Attributes, 295-303
 1. Holiness the Fundamental Attribute in God, 296-298
 2. The Holiness of God the Ground of Moral Obligation, 298-303
- Chapter II. Doctrine of the Trinity, 304-352
- I. In Scripture there are Three who are recognized as God, 305-322
 1. Proofs from the New Testament, 305-317
 - A. The Father is recognized as God, 305
 - B. Jesus Christ is recognized as God, 305-315
 - C. The Holy Spirit is recognized as God, 315-317
 2. Intimations of the Old Testament, 317-322
 - A. Passages which seem to teach Plurality of some sort in the Godhead, 317-319
 - B. Passages relating to the Angel of Jehovah, . . . 319-320
 - C. Descriptions of the Divine Wisdom and Word, 320-321
 - D. Descriptions of the Messiah, 321-322
 - II. These Three are so described in Scripture, that we are compelled to conceive them as distinct Persons, 322-326
 1. The Father and the Son are Persons distinct from each other, 322
 2. The Father and the Son are Persons distinct from the Spirit, 322-323
 3. The Holy Spirit is a Person, 323-326
 - III. This Tri-personality of the Divine Nature is not merely economic and temporal, but is immanent and eternal, 326-330
 1. Scripture Proof that these distinctions of Personality are eternal, 326
 2. Errors refuted by the Scripture Passages, . . . 327-330
 - A. The Sabellian, 327-328

- B. The Arian, 328-330
- VI While there are three Persons, there is but one Essence, 330-334
- V. These three Persons are Equal, 334-343
 - 1. These Titles belong to the Persons, 334-336
 - 2. Qualified Sense of these Titles, 335-340
 - 3. Generation and Procession consistent with Equality, 340-343
- VI. The Doctrine of the Trinity inscrutable, yet not self contradictory, but the Key to all other Doctrines, 344-352
 - 1. The Mode of this Triune Existence is inscrutable, 344-345
 - 2. The Doctrine of the Trinity is not self-contradictory, 345-347
 - 3. The Doctrine of the Trinity has important relations to other Doctrines, 347-352
- Chapter III The Decrees of God, 353-370
- I. Definition of Decrees, 353-355
- II. Proof of the Doctrine of Decrees, 355-359
 - 1. From Scripture, 355-356
 - 2. From Reason, 356-359
 - A. From the Divine Foreknowledge, 356-358
 - B. From the Divine Wisdom, 358
 - C. From the Divine Immutability, 358-359
 - D. From the Divine Benevolence, 359
- III. Objections to the Doctrine of Decrees, 359-368
 - 1. That they are inconsistent with the Free Agency of Man, , 359-362
 - 2. That they take away all Motive for Human Exertion, 363-364
 - 3. That they make God the Author of Sin, 365-368
- IV. Concluding Remarks, 368-370
 - 1. Practical Uses of the Doctrine of Decrees, 368-369
 - 2. True Method of Preaching the Doctrine 369-370

These two outlines need to be molded into one thorough Theology Proper section in a new 21st century Systematic Theology work.

Appendix 4 Covenant Theology Burkenshaw's Unsolicited Input

Have you noticed that the reformed theology of the covenant theologian has been very aggressive in attacking the dispensationalist on the net lately. Its Roman roots are showing more and more as the day approaches. Perhaps you should take it past the Westminster Confession of Faith (1647). To Augustine of Hippo (354-430 AD), in his humanistic work, *The City of God*, where he clearly taught the outlines of what would become central elements in the classic Reformed theology, the covenant of works and the covenant of grace. The major development in medieval covenant theology was the proposition by a Franciscan theologian, William of Ockham (1285-1347) and later by Gabriel Biel (1420-95). This is known as the Franciscan Pactum theology. Their slogan was, "To the one who does what he can, God will not deny grace." You know this teaching as, "God helps those who help themselves! That is simply the doctrine of Salvation by good works.

Tit 3:5 Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost;

Just as the current Jesuit (liberation theology) (Replacement theology) Hopeless Pope Frances (probably the queer) Pope Francis says atheists can do good and go to heaven too! "Just do good" was his challenge, "and we'll find a meeting point."

Ac 20:21 Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Holy Bible

Cambron, Mark G. *Bible Doctrines*. Grand Rapids, Michigan, Zondervan Publishing House, 1954, [Independent Baptist, Professor, Tennessee Temple Bible School, 1954].

Chafer, Lewis Sperry. *Systematic Theology*. Dallas Seminary Press, 1948.

Erickson, Millard J. *Christian Theology*. Baker Books, Grand Rapids, MI, 1985.

Gausson, L. *Theopneustia – The plenary Inspiration of The Holy Scriptures deduced from Internal Evidence, and the Testimonies of Nature, History and Science*. David Scott's translation, Chicago, The Bible Institute Colportage ASS'N., 1840.

Hodge, Charles. *Systematic Theology: Volume I-IV*. Charles Scribner & Company, 1871, Hardback- Grand Rapids, Mich., Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1940. [The Internet Archive www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01hodg], [Charles Hodge, 1797-1878, Presbyterian Minister, Princeton Theologian].

Miley, John. *Systematic Theology* Vol. 1 & 2. The Internet Archive <http://www.archive.org/details/systematictheolo01mile>, [John Miley (1813-1895, Methodist Theologian)].

Ryrie, Charles C.. *Basic Theology*. Victor Books, Wheaton, Illinois, 1981.

Scofield, C. I.. *Prophecy Made Plain*. Photolithoprinted by Grand Rapids Book Manufacturers, Grand Rapids, MI, 1967.

Shedd, William G. T.. *Dogmatic Theology*. Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York, Charles Scribner & Sons, 1888. [The Internet Archive www.archive.org/details/dogmatictheology01sheduoft], [William G.T. Shedd, 1820-1894, Old School Presbyterian & Reformed Theologian].

Strong, Augustus H.. *Systematic Theology: Three Volumes in 1*. Philadelphia, Valley Forge PA, The Judson Press, 1907, 35th printing 1993. [Augustus H. Strong, 1836-1921, American Baptist Pastor & Theologian].

Thiessen, Henry Clarence. *Lectures in Systematic Theology*. Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1949. [Henry Clarence Thiessen, ? -1947, President of Los Angeles Baptist Theological Seminary, later renamed John MacArthur's The Master's College].

TH 801 Advanced Systematic Theology Written Report

Lectures in Systematic Theology. Revised by Vernon D. Doerksen, Grand Rapids, Mich., William B. Eerdmann Publishing Company, 2006.

Waite, D.A.. *Defending the King James Bible*. The Bible For Today Press, 2002.